



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/664,820

09/17/2003

Gus Lopez

249768011US1

3436

25096 7590 03/08/2007  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
PATENT-SEA  
P.O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

AIRAPETIAN, MILA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/08/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment received on 12/08/2006 is acknowledged and entered. The applicant has amended claims 1, 62 and 68. Currently, claims 1, 3-10, 62, 65, 66, 68-71 are pending for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 62, 65, 66 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (US 6,411,960) in view of Walker et al. (hereinafter Walker) (US 6,415,264).**

**Claim 1.** Fisher teaches a method of generating an information page in a computer system comprising:

providing an item classification/attribute mapping data structure that maps item classifications to attributes, each item classification mapping to a set of attributes specific to that item classification (col. 4, lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 1-15),

Art Unit: 3625

receiving a selection of an item classification (col. 9, lines 56-57);

identifying the set of attributes specific to the selected item classification by  
retrieving the set of attributes from the item classification/attribute mapping  
data structure col. 11, lines 1-8),

providing a display of an indication of the identified attributes (col. 11, lines 1-8),

However Fisher does not teach:

receiving an input value for at least one attribute within the set of identified  
attributes from the user's computer system;

retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected  
item classification and that match the received input value of the one or  
more identified attributes,

analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item;  
and

sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a  
suggested bid price in an auction.

Walker teaches a method for determining a posting payment amount including  
receiving an input value for at least one attribute within the set of identified  
attributes from the user's computer system ((col. 3, lines 63-64) "*posting site device  
determines, based on the received information, a posting payment amount*" indicates  
receiving an input value from the user; col. 7, lines 30-40);

retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected  
item classification and that match the received input value of the one or

Art Unit: 3625

more identified attributes (col. 7, lines 1-19), and

analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item (col. 7, lines 15-19); and

sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction (col. 8, lines 13-16; communication between the posting site and the seller indicates that the user receiving the transaction price data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fisher to include retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected item classification and that match the received input value of the one or more identified attributes; analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item; and sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction, as disclosed in Walker, because it would encourage a seller to post an item for sale, especially at a reasonable price, so the posting site and the seller both benefit from a reasonable price (col. 2, lines 27-29; col. 8, lines 14-17).

**Claim 3.** Walker teaches said method wherein the records of transactions include records for both fixed-price sale and auction transactions (col. 10, lines 2-3).

**Claim 6.** Fisher teaches said method wherein the receiving of the selection of an item classification includes browsing through a browse category organization (col. 4, lines 6-10).

**Claim 8.** Fisher teaches said method wherein the receiving of the selection of

Art Unit: 3625

an item classification includes browsing through an item classification organization (col. 4, lines 6-10).

**Claim 9.** Fisher appears to teach said method wherein the selected item classification is not a leaf classification of an item classification hierarchy.

**Claim 62.** Fisher teaches a method of generating an information page in a computer system comprising:

providing an item classification/attribute mapping data structure that maps item classifications to attributes, each item classification mapping to a set of attributes specific to that item classification (col. 4, lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 1-15),

receiving from a user's computer system a selection of an item classification based on a mapping of the selected item classification to an identified attribute associated with the selected item classification, providing to the user's computer system an indication of the identified attribute (col. 9, lines 56-57), col. 10, lines 19-24;

Fisher does not teach specifically teach that the identified attribute is a condition attribute.

Walker teaches a method for determining a posting payment wherein an attributes is a condition attribute (col. 3, lines 59).

Fisher also does not teach:

receiving from the user's computer system a specification of an identified attribute value associated with the item;

retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected item classification and that match the received condition value, and

Art Unit: 3625

analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item;  
and

sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction.

Walker teach said method including receiving from the user's computer system a specification of an identified attribute value associated with the item ((col. 3, lines 63-64) "*posting site device determines, based on the received information, a posting payment amount*" indicates receiving an input value from the user; col. 7, lines 30-40);

retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected item classification and that match the received condition value (col. 7, lines 1-19), and

analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item (col. 7, lines 1-19); and

sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction (col. 8, lines 13-16; communication between the posting site and the seller indicates that the user receiving the transaction price data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fisher to include retrieving records of transactions for items that are classified within the selected item classification and that match the received condition value; analyzing the retrieved records to generate transaction price data for the item; and sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction, as disclosed in Walker, because it

Art Unit: 3625

would encourage a seller to post an item for sale, especially at a reasonable price, so the posting site and the seller both benefit from a reasonable price (col. 2, lines 27-29).

**Claim 65.** Walker teaches said method wherein the item is not new (col. 3, lines 49-50).

**Claim 66.** Walker teaches said method wherein the item is used (col. 3, lines 49-50).

**Claim 68.** All of the limitations in claim 68 are closely parallel to the limitations of claim 62, analyzed above and are rejected on the same basis.

**Claim 69.** Walker teaches said method wherein the specified condition value is excellent (col. 7, lines 34).

**Claim 70.** Walker teaches said method wherein the specified condition value is fair (col. 7, lines 34).

**Claim 71.** The method of claim 68 wherein the specified condition value is good (col. 7, lines 34).

**Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fisher and Walker, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mori et al. (hereinafter Mori) (US, 6,044,363).**

**Claim 4.** The combination of Fisher and Walker teaches all the limitations of claim 4 except one of the attributes within the set of attributes relates to duration of a transaction.



Mori teaches a method for automatic auction wherein the product attribute includes the time limit for auction and scheduled auction end time (col. 5, lines 66-67; col. 6, lines 1-6).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fisher and Walker to include one of the attributes within the set of attributes relates to duration of a transaction, as disclosed in Mori, because auction timing can be important to the seller's strategy when a seller wants to auction items before an end of a seasonal quarter (e.g. summer clothes), or before a holiday (e.g., Halloween costumes).

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fisher and Walker, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ching (US 6,078,901).**

**Claim 5.** The combination of Fisher and Walker teaches all the limitations of claim 5 including receiving a specification of attributes, except that said received attributes are to be served as x and y coordinates for a graph of the transaction price data.

Ching teaches a method for modeling prices in supply and demand environment wherein the obtained data is presented in a graph format (Figs. 5, 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fisher, Walker and Ching to that said received data

Art Unit: 3625

(attributes) are presented in graph format, as disclosed in Ching, because it would advantageously simplify the understanding of said received data.

**Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fisher and Walker, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boesjes (US 6,799,165).**

**Claim 7.** The combination of Fisher and Walker teaches all the limitations of claim 7 except said method wherein the receiving of the selection of an item classification includes receiving a specification of keywords and identifying an item classification that matches the specified keywords.

Boesjes teaches a method for inventory, sale, and delivery of goods wherein the shopper may select a product category and enter keywords and other search parameters (col. 8, lines 51-52).

The motivation to combine Fisher, Walker and Boesjes would be to simplify a search for required data.

**Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fisher and Walker, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Odom et al. (hereinafter Odom) (US 6,393,426).**

Art Unit: 3625

**Claim 10.** The combination of Fisher and Walker teaches all the limitations of claim 10 except the selected item classification is within a non-hierarchical item classification organization.

Odom teaches a method for modeling, storing and transferring data wherein data items are organized in a non-hierarchical form (col. 6, lines 1-26).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fisher and Walker to include the selected item classification is within a non-hierarchical item classification organization, as disclosed in Odom, because in a non-hierarchical organization all data coexist in parallel together, at once completely distinguishable and separately accessible, yet at the same time totally aware of and sequentially relatable to all other data items to which they are related (col. 6, lines 33-37).

### ***Response to Arguments***

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach sending to the user's computer system the generated transaction price data as a suggested bid price in an auction, it is noted that Walker was applied for this feature. Specifically, Walker teaches estimating the value of the item based on sales during the past year for the item (col. 7, lines 16-19) and conveying that information to the seller/user (col. 8, lines 13-16; communication between the posting site and the seller indicates receiving said information by the seller/user).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mila Airapetian whose telephone number is (571) 272-3202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MA

  
MATTHEW S. GART  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600